Case 5:05-mj-70886-MRGD Document 4 Filed 11/02/05 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

	E HORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff,	Case Number <u>(12-05-70886</u> HRL
Valentin Sapulueda Covarrubia, Defendant.	ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL
In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C	2. § 3142(f), a detention hearing was held on ////
Defendant was present, represented by his attorney 1).	thurny. The United States was represented by
Assistant U.S. Attorney S. Knight.	The Officer States was represented by
PART I. PRESUMPTIONS APPLICABLE	
	cribed in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and the defendant has been
convicted of a prior offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) while on release pending trial for a federal state or least	
offense, and a period of not more than five (5) years has ela	apsed since the date of conviction or the release of the person from
imprisonment, whichever is later.	re sured and date of conviction of the release of the person from
This establishes a rebuttable presumption that no c	ondition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the
safety of any other person and the community.	on a contomiction of contomons will reasonably assure the
/ / There is probable cause based upon (the indict	ment) (the facts found in Part IV below) to believe that the
defendant has committed an offense	
A. for which a maximum term of impriso	onment of 10 years or more is prescribed in 21 0.3.0.8 801 et
seq., § 951 et seq., or § 955a et seq., OR	Amond of to yours of more is presented in 21 8.5.4.8 801 et
B. under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c); use of a fire	earm during the commission of a felony.
This establishes a rebuttable presumption that no co	ondition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the
appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the	e community
No presumption applies.	005
PART II. REBUTTAL OF PRESUMPTIONS, IF APPLICABLE	SWEFFE WE
/ / The defendant has not come forward with any e	widence to rebut the applicable presumption[s], and the therefore
will be ordered detained.	the result was appreciable presumption[3], and the therefore
/ / The defendant has come forward with evidence	to rebut the applicable presumption[s] to wit-
	approved productipation[b] to with
Thus, the burden of proof shifts back to the United S	States.
PART III. PROOF (WHERE PRESUMPTIONS REBUTTED OR I	NAPPLICABLE)
The United States has proved to a preponderance	e of the evidence that no condition or combination of conditions
will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required, AND/OR	
/ / The United States has proved by clear and convincing evidence that no condition or combination of conditions	
will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community.	
PART IV. WRITTEN FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR DETENTION	
/ / The Court has taken into account the factors set out in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) and all of the information submitted	
at hearing and finds as follows: The alphalan is Charold muth a Violation of 81150 E1371 110	
is undocumented. He has a long enminal his fory including summered	
consuctions for under the influence	- He has 3 million turn Aller which is
of participations of has sell	my convictions for forcery ulchide
	incls.
His substance al	use and mability to comply with
Superusión requirements while on	Drobatum or parall make him a duckt
// Defendant, his attorney, and the AUSA have waiv	red written findings.
PART V. DIRECTIONS REGARDING DETENTION	
The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorne	y General or his designated representative for confinement in a
corrections facility separate to the extent practicable from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending	
appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a cour	
of the Officer States of on the request of an attorney for the Govern	nment, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver
the defendant to the United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.	
Dated: 11/2/05	$(\land) \land $
<i>1. 1</i>	Yaticia V Suntul
AUSA, PTS	PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL

United States Magistrate Judge